



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STATE, CHURCH, AND SCHOOL IN FRANCE

III. THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND SCHOOL

DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY
The Ethical Culture School, New York City

In the first two articles of this series we have studied the historical development of education in France, under the double aspect of the founding of a public-school system and the struggle of the liberal educators for the elimination of the century-long influence of the Roman church from the schools of France. We have marked the periods of progress and reaction in the struggle—the generous liberalism and confident rationalism of the fathers of the French Revolution, succeeded by the despotism of Napoleon Bonaparte; the optimistic educational radicalism of Guizot, followed by the infamous pact of Napoleon III and the clergy in the Loi Falloux; the renaissance of the free lay school in the Third Republic, combated by the church at every step, and charged with responsibility for all the sins of France. In the last two articles of the series we shall consider rather the actual working and theory of the lay moral instruction in the French schools.

To begin with some statistical facts. The first thing, perhaps, that strikes one in examining the curriculum of the public schools in France is the small space given to direct moral instruction, when one realizes that from the days of the Revolution down to the present the substitution of a lay morality for the ecclesiastical morality of the catechism and the sacred histories has been one of the chief aims, perhaps the chief aim, of the French educational reformers. In the lowest schools, the *écoles maternelles* or *écoles annexes*, there is no distinct moral instruction, but *morale* is bracketed with history for a half-hour a week. Naturally, all that is attempted here is an emphasis on the biography of good and patriotic men. Since 1882 the subject at the head of the curriculum for all the elementary schools (*écoles*

primaires) has been "moral and civic instruction."¹ But though "moral and civic instruction" heads the curriculum, it receives only one hour out of thirty or more hours a week of instruction. It is on an equality with writing, geography, agriculture or horticulture, and singing in this respect.

In the secondary schools the curriculum is arranged in cycles. Two so-called preparatory classes and the eighth and seventh forms carry the child to about the eleventh year; a second cycle of four years (the sixth to the third form inclusive) covers the higher grammar grades, and a third cycle of three years (the second, the first, and the philosophy-mathematics forms) finishes the youth's preparation for the Bachelor's degree, which comes in France at the close of the preparatory-school work, and not at the close of the work of the university.

The transition from the second to the third cycle corresponds roughly to the transition from grammar school to high school in our system, although the point reached at the close of the second cycle of the French *lycée* is higher than that reached in our eighth grades. The analogy is rather in the fact that boys often drop out of school at this point to go into business. For the sake of those who leave the *lycée* at this point the curriculum has been so arranged that a fairly complete secondary education is gained: the last three forms go over the same topics as those of the second cycle, but on a much higher plane. This cyclic arrangement explains why we find moral instruction in the third and fourth forms of the *lycée* (the two highest forms of the second cycle), and again in the philosophy form (the highest form of the third cycle). It is that the boys may not leave school without having had at least two years of systematic instruction in ethics. As to the first cycle, no separate hours are assigned for moral and civic instruction, but, as the program announces, "this instruction is given in connection with French history and geography."

Lay moral instruction is obligatory in all the grades of the

¹ The coupling of these adjectives shows the aim of the moral instruction in French schools: it is everywhere directed toward forming a character capable of appreciating the republican idea of solidarity.

écoles primaires. In the children's sections it consists of simple conversations on ethical topics, the learning by heart of short poems, songs, and stories with a moral point. Going into the elementary course the child of eight or nine years is taught to apply the precepts in personal responsibilities—his duty toward his schoolmates, the correction of uncharitable judgments and selfish passions, the elimination of childish fears, superstitious notions and bugaboos of all sorts. In the middle course, where the child is ten or eleven years old, personal relations are specially emphasized—the duties to one's parents and brothers and sisters, the proper attitude toward servants, the proper sense of obligation to one's masters at school, the duty to one's country, a reasoned and wise patriotism, the proper attitude toward society, toleration for differences of opinion, independence and bravery in one's own convictions, sincerity and truthfulness as the sole basis for permanent human association. "Throughout this course," says the Primary Syllabus of 1883, drawn up by Paul Janet, "the teacher begins by assuming the existence of conscience, of moral law, and duty. He appeals to the sentiment and idea of duty; he does not undertake to demonstrate them theoretically." In other words, there is no ethical instruction yet—only moral instruction; for morals differs from ethics as the practice from the theory, or, in the happy simile of Professor Palmer, as carpentry does from geometry. In the higher course, the last two years of the *école primaire*, practically the same subjects are treated as in the preceding division but in a much more philosophical way, with inquiry into the sources and nature of our moral obligations.

Complete religious liberty was the ideal of the system of lay instruction inaugurated in 1880. Jules Ferry, one of the most indefatigable laborers for the new education, said in a speech in the French Senate (March 16, 1882): "If a public-school teacher should so far forget himself as to institute in his school a teaching hostile or offensive to the religious beliefs of any person, he should be as severely and as quickly reprimanded as if he had struck one of his pupils." Of course it is an impossibility to preserve such absolute neutrality if moral

instruction is introduced. With mathematics, the classics, history even, perhaps, such neutrality is possible. But ethics is a different matter. The religious belief of parents who maintain that there can be no morals without religion is outraged by the omission of God from the curriculum; and the religious or a-religious belief of parents who maintain that morality is vitiated by religious doctrines is outraged by the insertion of God in the curriculum. The framers of the Syllabus of Primary Instruction tried to steer between Scylla and Charybdis by putting God in and neglecting him. Under section 3 of the middle course program we read:

Duties to God.—The teacher is not bound to give a lesson on the nature and attributes of God. The teaching which he should give to all indiscriminately is confined to two points:

First, he teaches his pupil that the name of God must not be taken in vain. With the idea of the First Cause and a Perfect Being he closely associates in their minds a feeling of respect and reverence; and he accustoms each child to feel this respect for the conception of Divinity, even when it is presented to him in a form entirely different from that of his own religion.

Afterwards, and without troubling about the special tenets of the various religious bodies, the teacher concentrates on making the child feel and understand that the first homage he owes to the Deity is obedience to the laws of God as revealed to him by his conscience and reason.

The textbook-makers have shown their embarrassment on the same question by generally devoting three or four pages only at the end of their manuals to a discussion of the theistic aspect of morals.

In the secondary schools, *lycées* and *collèges*, the moral instruction in the few grades where it is given does not differ materially from that in the primary schools, except for a rather astounding program in the last year (called the philosophical-mathematics form). The philosophical section of this form has a schedule of eight hours a week of philosophy, in which the whole ground of moral, mental, and emotional philosophy is covered. Aesthetics, psychology, logic, metaphysics, and ethics follow in rapid succession, each having approximately a two-months period. The ethics is scheduled for May and June. Just what idea of the vast subject of ethics can be given to

boys of seventeen or eighteen in two months at the close of a year filled with the hardest kind of work in thirty periods or so per week, is difficult to imagine.

And indeed if we turn from the curriculum to the criticism of the method and results of the moral teaching in the French schools, we are met with a not very encouraging response. Professor Farrington of the University of Texas, who has spent some years studying the primary and secondary systems of education in France, and whose reports on the subject in the *Columbia Studies* and in the new book recently published by Longmans, called *Secondary Education in France*, are, with the exception of the three volumes prepared by the French government for the Exposition of 1900, the best account we have of education in France, says in his study of the public primary-school system:

Since 1882 moral and civic instruction has headed the list of the required subjects in the elementary schools. The moral aspect, until that time completely obscured by the religious instruction, then for the first time took a predominant place in the work of the French schools. It represents the efforts of the people who had just forced religious teaching out of the program, to find an effective and at the same time non-sectarian means of developing the ethical side of the child's nature. Undoubtedly the previous religious instruction was entirely formal and empty, for it consisted merely in going through the various articles of the catechism without comment; but it is very doubtful if its present substitute is much richer in real content. It savors too much of the narrow-minded doctrines of our Puritan ancestors. I have visited many classes and talked with still more people on the subject, but I have yet to find a single class where the teacher ever rose to any ethical basis above the idea of reward and punishment. Whatever may be their real feelings in the matter, their teaching never seems to reach the point of doing right for right's sake.

This reminds one of Matthew Arnold's severe judgment, passed soon after the system of lay moral instruction was organized in the schools. In his *Report on Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France*, in 1886, he says:

All direct religious instruction, Catholic or Protestant, has been banished from the French schools, and the moral and civic instruction which is the substitute seemed to me, so far as I could judge from the manual of it which I perused, and the many lessons in it which I heard, of little or no value.

Matthew Arnold's judgment is open to the charge of having been made before the system had a chance to find its method and its men; and Farrington's, of being the judgment of a foreigner who, perhaps with the best of intention and closest observation, could not appreciate the French spirit. We have, however, the opinion of such a man as Jules Payot, rector of the Academy of Aix, whose textbooks on morals and whose constant devotion to the idea of lay education qualify him to pronounce on this subject. He says in the preface to his *Cours de morale*:

As to the moral instruction in our *lycées* and our schools, it is independent of dogmas to be sure, but it is not always independent of that state of mind which results from long traditions of dogma. Moral instruction is not yet "laicized." The courses given are simply sermons invoking the authority of a *duty* which is accepted without being reasoned upon. Like the old religious instruction, it commands but does not demonstrate. Do this, do that! it says. It gives not principles but a suite of episodes, cases, without a bond of union. It discusses duties to self, duties to neighbors, duties to family, duties to animals, etc., leaving in the child's head only a chaos of unorganized memories, which cannot exert a permanent, constructive influence on his conduct.

The moral teaching, in other words, in the judgment of these critics, not only is not organized to illustrate and further the development of a harmonious ethical theory, but it is not further connected with the other disciplines of the curriculum. It is a thing apart confined to its own hour in the program, whereas it should be the guiding idea in the treatment of history, literature, and the other subjects of the day. The ethics hour should be only, as it were, the laboratory period in which is prepared the moral yeast which is to inform and raise all the instruction of the school.

Of course there are educators who follow the opinion of Alfred Croiset, the venerable dean of the Faculty of Letters at the Sorbonne, in opposing any direct moral instruction in specific hours devoted to ethics lessons—as there are many American teachers who feel the same way. But on the whole the system of lay moral instruction is firmly fixed in the French schools, and the very hostility of the clergy to that teaching

(increasing as it constantly has in the last decade) will insure its continuance without other motive.

In fact, the whole question of moral instruction in France is so complicated with the great struggle between church and state which has raged with renewed energy in France since the days of the Dreyfus affair that we cannot touch an aspect of it (program, teacher, textbook) without coming immediately into the clash of the controversy. With us the public schools are generally free of the state and entirely free of the clergy. Their direction is, where the direction of the schools should properly be, in the hands of the community which they serve. In France the school, after long vassalage to the church, now comes into sudden vassalage to the state. It is inevitable that it should be the first prize of battle in the conflict between church and state.

Since the great educational laws of 1880-83, which freed the public schools of ecclesiastical control, the church has been pushed harder and harder by the state. In 1901 the congregations not authorized by the Associations Law were driven from France and their institutions of learning closed. In 1905 the hundred-year-old *Concordat* between church and state was dissolved and the public treasury was relieved of the payment of the salary of all the ministers of religion in the state. Deprived of the greater part of their own monastic schools, forced to support their priesthood and maintain their churches and cathedrals by private contributions, the Catholic church from the Pope down to the last member of the hierarchy registered its protest against the "strange and ardent fever of impiety which had seized on the men who direct the nation." "They wish," said Pius X in addressing a delegation of French bishops at the Vatican, in November, 1909, "to suppress even the very idea of Christianity, and under the pretext of shaking off the dogmatic and moral yoke of the church they acclaim another authority as absolute as it is illegitimate—the supremacy of the state as arbiter of religion and supreme oracle of the doctrine of righteousness."

The chief point of attack of the church today against the impiety of the state is the lay school.

Not content [writes a French bishop in complaining of the usurpations of the state] with attacking the church, our enemies now try to detach our children from our doctrine. Infidel schoolmasters, encouraged by the ministry in power,² have tried to pervert the minds of these little children especially consigned to our care by the precepts of Christ. We accepted the law of neutrality (law of 1882); they have violated it. Partisan textbooks have been placed in the hands of our children. The Christian morals have been insulted and derided. The rôle of the church in history has been misrepresented and put in an odious light. . . . Fathers of families have protested to their priests, and the priests have asked the bishops to see to it that the conscience of the child is respected in the schools.

The French bishops accordingly published a letter in September, 1909, in which they condemned scholastic neutrality and demanded that the Catholic children in the lay schools should be taught in a way to meet the approval of parents guided by the clergy. At the same time certain ecclesiastics attacked by name some of the authors of textbooks of history and morals used in the school. Cardinal Archbishop Luçon of Rheims was sued by two associations of teachers for his condemnation of the curriculum, and even the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur Amette, was brought to court by Professor Aulard of the Sorbonne and Professor Debidour, whose textbook on history he had attacked as "inspired by the spirit of lying and deceit."

The church has left no doubt as to the object and grounds of its complaint. A little brochure published in Rheims, entitled *Les manuels condamnés*, places nine histories, four textbooks on morals and civics, and a collection of classical readings on the scholastic index, as tending to make the students free-thinkers and enemies of the church by "un enseignement athée, fait en haine de Dieu et dans l'ignorance ou le travestissement de nos meilleures traditions nationales." The condemned books are carefully analyzed, and the conclusion is, "Après un tel enseignement que reste-t-il de la morale catholique?" The authors would probably answer, "Rien, heureusement!"

In the middle of January, 1910, the French Chamber reached

² M. Doumergue, minister of public instruction, had assured the teachers that he would resolutely defend the rights of the lay school, including the privilege which the masters had of selecting their own textbooks from lists approved by the state.

the discussion of the budget for the schools, and after an intense debate the government won a magnificent majority in support of the lay schools. The division seems to show that the bishops have overshot the mark in their attack on the curriculum and the textbooks and that the sympathy of the people (for the French deputies stand far closer to the people than do our American congressmen) is in favor of the continuance of the program of the eighties. It has made the clerical party cast about for other means of modification of the curriculum than attack and defamation. It has been suggested that a mixed commission of clericals and free-thinkers be appointed to revise or compile textbooks of history and morals which shall be, if not entirely acceptable, at least less offensive to the clergy. One hears rumors from Paris that the French bishops are trying to effect a *rapprochement* between the state and the Vatican, though the hardened free-thinkers speak still in Taine's phrase of the impossibility of "diplomacy with the immovable church." One of the clauses mooted in the *rapprochement* is the recognition of the Catholic schools (*écoles libres*) provided they are subject to the academy inspectors, i.e., that the state inspectors have the right to interdict the use of such books as they disapprove of and to reprimand or discipline teachers for offenses as in the state schools. The stone of stumbling in any scheme of reconciliation will be the refusal of the French government to deal directly with the Pope, and the refusal of the Pope to let the government deal directly with the French bishops. It is the old, old question, as old as William the Conqueror and Henry of Anjou, of the divided allegiance of the churchmen to the government at home and the government at Rome.

But whatever concessions might be made by either side through considerate diplomacy and a kindly spirit of common nationality, in the matter of the restitution of confiscated property, the recognition of state inspection, the enregistration of associations, the legalization of seminaries, it is impossible that the church could approve the lay instruction in morals. That is in direct contradiction to the Roman doctrine that morality

is a corollary of revealed religion, impossible except on the basis of dogmas furnished to the believer through the mediacy of the priesthood. The criticism of the lay school and its moral postulates is therefore absolutely hostile in principle, destructive, and anathematizing on the part of the church. And as both the clergy and the free-thinkers are fortified in their conviction of the true basis and method of moral teaching, it is difficult to see any end to the strife between them—any higher unity into which their differences can be merged.

There is another kind of criticism of moral instruction in France—hopeful, constructive, reformatory—by the friends of the present system, who realize its defects and are laboring for its greater efficiency. The first and chief point in this criticism is that the lay morality of the schools lacks a philosophy, in other words, a reasoned ethics first comprehended and appropriated by the teachers, then mediated to the students in a way to make them progressively appropriate its theorems as experimental truth; a change of the point of view, as Payot puts it, which substitutes for the method of authority still in vogue (an inheritance from the old religious catechetical instruction) the constant appeal to experience, reflection, reason. The non-*efficacious* sermon must yield to the scientific persuasion of a philosophy founded on the results of actual ethical progress in the last three centuries, under the régime of modern scientific thought. We must have a great dominating and orientating truth in our ethics teaching, and every lesson must be only a point of view, an aspect, a function of this truth, leading the student first by one path, then by another, to the rediscovery for himself of the truth which his teachers have grasped. The principle, fortified year after year by these new instances, will gain a momentum in the child's spiritual life; his mind will assimilate day by day facts, ideas, feelings, which it will organize under the direction of the ethical principle, and will grow on these nourishing elements, as the healthy plant grows in the sunlight, appropriating the nourishing properties of the soil.

The instructors in morals in the French schools have not

yet, in sufficient numbers, found that constructive principle of ethics. The lay school has been too much concerned to emphasize its neutrality, its intellectual liberty. But neutrality and liberty, valuable and indispensable as they are for the development of a sane morality, are as yet only negative terms: they do not denote an ethical principle but only prescribe the conditions under which the principle is to be developed. Of themselves they are as favorable to moral anarchy as to moral unity. The positive ethical principle must be found which shall replace the authoritative dogma of the church.

This principle the leaders of lay education in France find in the revolutionary philosophy which first made earnest with Aristotle's dictum that man is a *reasoning* animal. Reason and the republic are the bases of morals which they oppose to the revelation and hierarchy of their ecclesiastical opponents. And reason, though it rejects the notion of a divine, supra-human authority imposing itself by a consecrated priesthood through a mysterious process of grace, does not thereby abolish the obligation of authority. Nay, it makes the determination of moral authority doubly incumbent on the ethical philosopher. What has moral compulsion in it must be worshipful. The human reason is no more worshipful than any other tool or method. It is not in itself an ethics but only a gymnastics. It calls for the determination of an authority under which it can work in freedom and full efficiency—for the formulation of a scientific morality, replacing the old dogmatic morality, reaching the same profound depths of the human soul and responding to the same eternal needs of the individual and of humanity. The lay school must cease to put all its emphasis on the negative propaedeutic of neutrality and liberty. It must avow the great republican principles of human solidarity, human rationality, human capacity, not equal but far superior to the dogmatic and imperialistic teaching of the church. It must have no fear to show the same immense confidence in these principles to found a new society of justice and fraternity on earth that the church has in its dogmas to open to the faithful an eternity of bliss in heaven. It must assert the dignity of these principles

in the minds of the growing generation, supporting them not by the authority of the past but by promise of the future.

The task is tremendous which the champions of lay and moral instruction in France have assumed—but a nobler task would be hard to find in the whole range of human activities.

I have spoken of the destructive, annihilating criticism of the lay school by the clericals, and of the constructive, hopeful criticism or reformation of the lay school by its own devoted champions. In conclusion I should like to mention what appeared to me as a foreign visitor some of the faults in the French schools which, though not directly connected with lay moral instruction, seem to me inevitably to react upon the morale of the school and hinder the best application of ethical teaching. The first thing which appears to me to affect the whole moral tone of the French school is the overloading of the student with work. We have little idea in America of the severe and sustained work of the French schoolboy. In the program of 1902 for the boys' higher primary schools (for lads fourteen to seventeen) there are no fewer than thirty recitation hours a week scheduled in any grade, and in the *écoles pratiques* (under the Ministry of Commerce) I find the prescribed hours in the industrial department running up to fifty-one per week, or eight and one-half hours a day (excluding Sundays) of actually prescribed duties. And in addition to that the boy must find time for the preparation of his work. One must admire the power of concentration which these youths develop early in life and the courage with which they "scorn delights and live laborious days" in the early teens. Yet the effect on their physical and moral health is bad. They have no opportunity for leisurely reflection with perfectly aerated brains, and the pent-up spirit of youth often breaks out in wild excesses when the stern discipline of the secondary school is changed for the absolute freedom of the university.

The dull and strict formality of the discipline of the French school is another fault in the eyes of an American visitor. With us there is much good-fellowship and co-operation between scholar and teacher—a sort of mutual understanding,

without which it seems to me the work in ethical instruction of all subjects must be futile. In France one sees almost no personal relationship between teacher and pupil. Authority and obedience are the qualities noticed. I have often heard what seemed to me perfectly intelligent and justifiable questions or comments on the part of the pupils dismissed curtly by the instructor as intrusions on the time of the class, and groping answers, which needed only a little sympathetic guidance to a clear understanding of the question, treated with brutal sarcasm. The masters are *masters* in the classroom. They invariably have magnificent command of their subject (the French standards for the teaching license guarantee that), but they are so far above their pupils that they often find it difficult to come down to their level. Moreover the sensitive, mercurial Gallic temperament makes a student's botching of a lesson peculiarly painful to many of the instructors. One is often obliged to accuse them of failing in patience—that first and last requisite of the true teacher.

As one would expect from the overloaded programs and the stern discipline of the pupils, the competitive idea is dominant in the French schools. Perhaps no other feature of school life in France militates so strongly against a rational and human system of ethical instruction, or at least the application of such instruction to the daily school life, as this emphasis on rewards and punishments. The student is compassed round about with percentages. Even the teachers are rewarded by bronze medals, silver medals, violet ribbons, and yellow ribbons. Prizes are given by the state for all sorts of proficiency and accomplishments, even to the encouragement of vaccination among the children. In the *écoles primaires* the student takes home a report each day to be signed by the parent and returned the next morning. The mind of the boy is constantly fixed on this pedagogical barometer. At stated intervals the principal of the school appears before each class and makes his comments on the report books. He reads out the name of the boy, who rises respectfully and quakingly to his feet. Then follows an outspoken criticism of the record, often with severe and sarcastic

denunciation enough to kill any courage in the boy's soul, sometimes with laudation enough to make him a conceited prig—in either case scarcely conducive to the moral development which the week's ethics lesson had tried to foster. This competitive aspect of school life extends to the homes. The *Revue pédagogique* a few years ago published the results of an *enquête* or *questionnaire* sent to the schools of one of the French departments. Pupils to the number of 27,000 in the intermediate grades of the primary school (boys and girls eleven and twelve years old) were questioned, and over 70 per cent of them (15,000 boys, 12,000 girls) replied that they were rewarded by their parents when they got good marks and punished by them when they got poor ones. The idea of reward and punishment, which so completely dominated the old catechetical moral instruction in the French schools, has had its lasting effect on the character of the people, and the new lay morality founded on the reasonableness of the good, the good for its own sake and as its own reward, has a persistent enemy to fight in this mercenary conception of morals.

Finally I would mention what struck me as a great obstacle to the inculcation of a fine ethical spirit in the French schools in the lack of any aesthetic helps to the cultivation of ethical feelings. The French classrooms are bare and forbidding: a little table, for the master, benches for the boys, windows generally dingy, an old stove in the corner with its uncertain pipe meandering diagonally across the room suspended like Mohammed's coffin half-way between floor and ceiling. I never saw a picture in a French classroom or a bust or statue in the corridor. Even the necessary helps to study, good maps, globes, charts, are almost entirely wanting. The attempt of a Minister of Public Education some ten or twelve years ago to supply this defect was as pathetic as it was sincere. "The school," wrote Minister Leygues, "is not merely a place of instruction for youths from six to thirteen years of age; it ought to be a homelike place where the adult could return to the scenes of his youth. I desire that these centers of friendship and comradeship should be decorated in a manner appropriate to their

purpose.” But in proof of the sincerity of this very proper sentiment all M. Leygues could do was to distribute among the schools of the country a number of colored railroad posters, representing in brilliant blues and reds the attractive scenery of the Juras and the Riviera. When one steps from the portals of a public school into a photographer’s shop filled with the most beautiful photographs, carbons, and etchings of the choicest works of art in the world, one wonders why some little part at least of the millions of francs which the state spends each year in the encouragement of art should not be put into the beautification of the public school.

The best of the French educators are alive to the imperfections and inadequacies of the lay school today, but they know better than any casual visitor to France or even than any careful reader of the century-long struggle for the public lay school what difficulties in the temper and inheritance of the French people, in the long monopoly of education and charity by the church, in the divided political councils and unstable ministries, confront the man who is laboring for the realization of the revolutionary program of a solidarity of Frenchmen founded on reason and democracy—the spiritual and the political rights of man. What these champions of lay education have done in the last thirty years is remarkable—perhaps the most remarkable educational achievement in modern history. The courage and constancy with which they have performed their task against discouragement from the state, denunciation from the church, and general indifference from the public is the best guarantee of the accomplishment of what yet remains to be done to make the lay school the most powerful ethical factor in the French Republic.

References: Jules Payot, *Cours de morale* (Paris, 1909), *Aux instituteurs et aux institutrices* (1905); Fortemps et Veilleur, *Législation financière de l’instruction primaire* (Paris, 1907); F. Martel, *Annuaire de l’enseignement primaire* (1885–1910); F. Vial, *L’enseignement secondaire et la démocratie*; H. Marion, *Leçons de morale*; Bonet-Maury, *La liberté de conscience en France* (1598–1905); Farrington, Debidour, Bracq, Croiset, Bert, as in preceding article.